Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/700,995	HAHN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tuan A. Vu	2193

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) *Tuan A. Vu*.　　　　　　　　　　　(3)_____.

(2) *Ali Imam*.　　　　　　　　　　　　(4)_____.

Date of Interview: *24 August 2007*.

Type:　a)☐ Telephonic　b)☐ Video Conference
　　　c)☒ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant　2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:　d)☐ Yes　e)☒ No.
　If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: *1 and 6*.

Identification of prior art discussed: *n/a*.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached.　g)☐ was not reached.　h)☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: *See Continuation Sheet*.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

_____
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The representative presented the effect of facilitating a test by using a specific format of file wherein sequence of test values/parameters are arranged and that way, would be more effective than prior art way of reinstantiating test input file from anew. The Examiner had inquired on the true intent of the application in terms of applying this file format and order of parameters; and it appeared as though the order of paremeters as claimed would be for expediting a test and for facilitating portability of test values from one test instance to a next instance via reusability of the same file format. The Examiner has suggested claim 6 to be changed to provide the test value/parameter related order/format requirement between step C and D; and claim 1 to include a software instructions to operate on the data structure that store the above parameters, so that the instructions execute the steps of extracting, listing and positioning when the medium-stored data structure is operated upon by the instructions. Also recommended was that the amended claims have to have proper support from the Specifications to emphasize of the order at which the structure has been laid out, with weight given to this order so that it would dictate a way of testing or recreating some input file for subsequent testing-- as in step D of claim 6; and care shoud be imparted to make it clear when functionality operates as opposed to when non-statutory subject matter only describes layout of data..